# Gnarles Barkley 1AC

Stop telling people you’re so “OCD”

Stop joking that you have a mental illness

If you really are just organized

When you say things like this

It trivializes my experience

Stop telling me mental illness is something I can control

Stop conflating nerves with a panic attack

Until I was 13 I didn’t know I was any different

I thought paralyzing anxiety was normal

Because that IS my normal

Stop telling people you’re going to kill yourself

Stop saying things are “depressing”

Because jokes about serious mental illness

Didn’t just stop being funny

To me they never were

It’s time for people to take mental illness seriously- stop using phrases like “depressed”, “bipolar”, and “OCD” casually. You may not know how these conflations hurt those around you, because the sneaky part about mental illnesses is their invisibility.

AND

Trivializing the lived experiences of individuals denies their opportunity to receive support and feel justified. When you make jokes about psychiatric conditions those individuals feel unjustified and potentially discourage them from treating their illness as such.

You can’t have tangible proof of my mental illness. Proof doesn’t exist but that doesn’t make my scars less real- it just gives people an excuse to doubt them. When I was younger my dad tried to get custody of me and take me off of my psychiatric medication because he thought my mental illness was a problem of willpower- something I can control. Depression and anxiety are legitimate illnesses and you can’t just “get over it”. I’m lucky because my story has a happy ending- it’s time to help those whose stories don’t.

I advocate that adolescents with disabilities ought to have the right to make autonomous medical choices in order to fully engage and explore this facet of their identity. I reserve the right to clarify and will comply in CX.

The role of the judge is to facilitate an environment for a feminist approach to disability- Garland-Thomson explains:

Rosemarie Garland-Thomson. Integrating Disability, Transforming Feminist Theory. NWSA Journal Vol. 14, No. 3, Feminist Disability Studies (Autumn 2002) pp. 1-32. The Johns Hopkins University Press. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4316922>. CM

**Academic feminism** is a complex and contradictory matrix of theories,∂ strategies, pedagogies, and practices. One way to think about feminist∂ theory is to say that it investigates how culture saturates the particularities∂ of bodies with meanings and probes the consequences of those∂ meanings. Feminist theory **is a** **collaborative,** interdisciplinary inquiry∂ **and a self-conscious** cultural **critique that interrogates** how subjects are∂ multiply interpellated: in other words, **how** the **representational systems**∂ of gender, race, ethnicity, ability, sexuality, and class mutually construct,∂ **inflect, and contradict one another.** **These systems intersect to produce**∂and sustain ascribed, achieved, and acquired **identities**-both those that∂ claim us and those that we claim for ourselves. **A feminist disability**∂ **theory introduces the ability/disability system as a category of analysis** into this diverse **and** diffuse enterprise. It **aims to extend current notions**∂ **of** cultural **diversity** and to more fully integrate the academy and the∂ larger world it helps shape.∂ **A feminist disability approach fosters complex understandings of the**∂ **cultural history of the body**. By considering the ability/disability system,∂ feminist disability theory goes beyond explicit disability topics such as∂ illness, health, beauty, genetics, eugenics, aging, reproductive technologies,∂ prosthetics, and access issues. **Feminist disability theory addresses**∂ such broad feminist concerns as the unity of the category woman, the∂ status of the lived body, the politics of appearance, **the medicalization**∂ **of the body, the privilege of normalcy**, multiculturalism, sexuality, **the**∂ **social construction of identity, and the commitment to integration**. To∂ borrow Toni Morrison's notion that blackness is an idea that permeates∂ American culture, **disability** too is **a pervasive**, often unarticulated,∂ **ideology informing our cultural notions of self** and other (1992). Disability-like∂ gender-is a concept that pervades all aspects of culture:∂ its structuring institutions, social identities, cultural practices, political∂ positions, historical communities, and the shared human experience of∂ embodiment.

And, feminist disability theory critiques common issues within white feminism- restructures the way we view how identities shape us. Garland Thompson 2:

**Integrating disability into feminist theory is** generative, broadening our collective inquiries, questioning our assumptions, and **contributing to feminism's intersectionality**. Introducing a disability analysis does not narrow the inquiry, limit the focus to only women with disabilities, or preclude engaging other manifestations of feminisms. Indeed, the multiplicity of foci we now call feminisms is not a group of fragmented, competing subfields, but rather a vibrant, complex conversation. In **talking about feminist disability theory**, I am not proposing yet another discrete feminism, but suggesting instead some ways that thinking about disability **transforms feminist theory.** Integrating disability does not obscure our critical focus on the registers of race, sexuality, ethnicity, or gender, nor is it additive. Rather, considering **disability shifts the conceptual framework to strengthen our understanding of how** these multiple **systems intertwine,** redefine, and mutually constitute one another. **Integrating disability clarifies how this aggregate of systems operates together**, yet distinctly, to support an imaginary norm and structure the relations that grant power, privilege, and status to that norm. Indeed, the cultural function of the disabled figure is to act as a synecdoche for all forms that culture deems non-normative. **We need to study disability in a feminist context to direct our** highly honed **critical skills toward** the dual scholarly tasks of **unmasking and reimagining disability, not only for people with disabilities, but for everyone**. As Simi Linton puts it, **studying disability is "a prism through which one can gain a broader understanding of society and human experience**" (1998, 118). It deepens our understanding of gender and sexuality, individualism and equality, minority group definitions, autonomy, wholeness,∂ independence, dependence, health, physical appearance, aesthetics,∂ the integrity of the body, community, and ideas of progress and perfection∂ in every aspect of cultures. A **feminist disability theory introduces** what∂ Eve Sedgwick has called **a "universalizing view" of disability that will**∂ **replace a**n often persisting "**minoritizing view**." Such a view will cast disability∂ as "an issue of continuing, determinative importance in the lives∂ of people across the spectrum" (1990, 1). In other words, **understanding**∂ how **disability** operates as an identity category and cultural concept **will**∂ **enhance how we understand what it is to be human**, our relationships∂ with one another, and the experience of embodiment. The constituency∂ for feminist disability studies is all of us, not only women with disabilities:∂ **disability is the most human of experiences**, touching every family∂ and-if we live long enough-touching us all.

And, critical theory is key to engaging difficult issues and incorporating them into academic conversations.

Giroux:

Henry A. Giroux. Introduction: Democracy, Education, and the Politics of Critical Pedagogy. Counterpoints Vol. 299, Critical Pedagogy: Where Are We Now? (2007) pp. 1-5. Peter Lang AG. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/42979396>. CM

What makes **critical pedagogy** so dangerous to Christian evangelicals, neoconservatives,∂ and right-wing nationalists in the United States and Canada today is that central to its very∂ definition **is** the task of **educating students to become critical agents who actively question**∂ and negotiate the **relationships between theory and practice**, critical analysis and common∂ sense, and learning and social change\* Critical pedagogy refuses the official lies of power∂ and the utterly reductive notion of being a method. On the contrary, paraphrasing Bill∂ Moyers, it is, in part, part of a project whose purpose is to dignify "people so they become∂ fully free to claim their moral and political agency."1 **Critical pedagogy opens up a space**∂ **where students** should be able to **come to terms with their own power as critical agents**; it∂ provides a sphere where the unconditional freedom to question and assert is central to the∂ purpose of the university, if not democracy itself 2 **Pedagogy** also **makes a space available**∂ **for** an argument about the responsibility of the present for a democratic future. And as a∂ political and moral practice, pedagogy should "make evident the multiplicity and complexity∂ of history," as **a narrative to enter into critical dialogue** with rather than accept unquestioningly.∂ Similarly, such a **pedagogy should cultivate in students a** healthy **skepticism about**∂ **power**, a "willingness to temper any reverence for authority with a sense of critical awareness."3∂ As a performative practice, pedagogy should provide the conditions for students to be able to reflectively frame their own relationship to the ongoing project of an unfinished democracy. It is precisely this relationship between democracy and pedagogy that is so threatening to conservatives such as David Horowitz. **Pedagogy** always represents a commitment to the future, and it **remains the task of educators to make** sure that the future points the way to **a more socially just world**, a world **in** which the **discourses of critique** and possibility in conjunction with the values of reason, freedom, and equality function to alter, as part of a broader democratic project, the grounds upon which life is lived. This is hardly a prescription for political indoctrination, but it is a project that gives education its most valued purpose and meaning, which in part is "to encourage human agency, not mold it in the manner of Pygmalion."\* It is also a position that threatens right-wing private advocacy groups, neoconservative politicians, and conservative extremists because they recognize that such a pedagogical commitment goes to the very heart of what it means to address real inequalities of power at the social level and to conceive of education as a project for democracy and critical citizenship while at the same time foregrounding a series of important and often ignored questions such as: Why do we [as educators] do what we do the way we do it? Whose interests does higher education serve? How might it be possible to understand and engage the diverse contexts in which education takes place? In spite of the right-wing view that equates indoctrination with any suggestion of politics, critical pedagogy is not simply concerned with offering students new ways to think critically and act with authority as agents in the classroom; it is also concerned with providing students with the skills and knowledge necessary for them to expand their capacities both to question deep-seated assumptions and myths that legitimate the most archaic and disempowering social practices that structure every aspect of society and to take responsibility for intervening in the world they inhabit. Education is not neutral, but that does not mean it is merely a form of indoctrination. On the contrary, as a practice that attempts to expand the capacities necessary for human agency and hence the possibilities for democracy itself, **the university must nourish those pedagogical practices that promote** "a concern with **keeping** the forever unexhausted and unfulfilled human **potential open**, fighting back all attempts to foreclose and pre-empt the further unravelling of human possibilities, prodding human society to go on questioning itself and preventing that questioning from ever stalling or being declared finished."^ In other words, **critical pedagogy forges both critique and agency through** a language of skepticism and possibility and a culture of openness, **debate, and engagement**, all elements that are now at risk in the latest and most dangerous attack on higher education.

The role of the ballot is to vote for the debater who provides the best praxis to deconstruct stigma around mental illness and disability.

The feminization of disability studies is necessary to stop the proliferation that individuals should strive to be normal- my methodology is the first step to stopping the perpetuation of stigma. Garland-Thomson:

Rosemarie Garland-Thomson. Integrating Disability, Transforming Feminist Theory. NWSA Journal Vol. 14, No. 3, Feminist Disability Studies (Autumn 2002) pp. 1-32. The Johns Hopkins University Press. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4316922>. CM

**Feminist disability theory**'s radical critique **hinges on** a broad **understanding** of **disability as a** pervasive cultural **system that stigmatizes** certain kinds of **bodily variations**. At the same time, this system has the potential to incite a critical politics. **The** informing **premise of feminist disability theory is that disability**, like femaleness, **is not a** natural **state of** corporeal **inferiority**, inadequacy, excess, or a stroke of misfortune. **Rather,** **disability is a** culturally fabricated **narrative of the body, similar to** what we understand as the fictions of **race and gender**. **The disability**/ ability **system produces subjects by differentiating and marking bodies.** Although **this** comparison of bodies is ideological rather than biological, it nevertheless **penetrates** into the formation of **culture, legitimating an unequal distribution of resources, status, and power** within a biased social and architectural environment. As such, disability has four aspects: first, it is a system for interpreting and disciplining bodily variations; second, it is a relationship between bodies and their environments; third, it is a set of practices that produce both the able-bodied and the disabled; fourth, it is a way of describing the inherent instability of the embodied self. The disability system excludes the kinds of bodily forms, functions, impairments, changes, or ambiguities that call into question our cultural fantasy of the body as a neutral, compliant instrument of some transcendent will. Moreover, **disability** is a broad term within which cluster ideological **categories** as varied as sick, deformed, crazy, ugly, old, maimed, afflicted, mad, abnormal, or debilitated-all of which **disadvantage people by devaluing bodies that do not conform to cultural standards**. Thus, **the disability system functions to preserve** and validate such **privileged designations** as beautiful, healthy, normal, fit, competent,∂ intelligent-all of **which provide cultural capital** to those who can claim∂ such statuses, who can reside within these subject positions. It is, then,∂ the various interactions between bodies and world that materialize disability∂ from the stuff of human variation and precariousness.∂ **A feminist disability theory denaturalizes disability by unseating the**∂ **dominant assumption that disability is something that is wrong with**∂ **someone**. By this I mean, of course, that **it mobilizes feminism's highly**∂ **developed and complex critique of** gender, class, race, ethnicity, and sexuality∂ as exclusionary and **oppressive systems** rather than as the natural∂ and appropriate order of things. To do this, **feminist disability theory**∂ **engages** several of the fundamental **premises of critical theory**: 1) that∂ representation structures reality, 2) that the margins define the center,∂ 3) that gender (or disability) is a way of signifying relationships of power,∂ 4) that human identity is multiple and unstable, 5) that all analysis and∂ evaluation have political implications.

Individuals need to be able to reclaim the disabled identity. The way I relate to my mental illness determines how I solve the stigma that surrounds me- individuals need to be able to formulate their identity in regards to disability in the way they see fit. This is the only method that allows individuals to resist the stigma around their disability Garland-Thomson:

Rosemarie Garland-Thomson. Integrating Disability, Transforming Feminist Theory. NWSA Journal Vol. 14, No. 3, Feminist Disability Studies (Autumn 2002) pp. 1-32. The Johns Hopkins University Press. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4316922>. CM

**Passing as nondisabled complicates** ethnic and queer studies' analyses∂ of how this seductive but psychically estranging **access to privilege**∂ operates. **Some** of my friends, for example, have measured their regard∂ for me by **say**ing, "But **I don't think of you as disabled."** What they point∂ to **in such a compliment is** **the** **contradiction** **they find between their**∂ **perception of** me as **a valuable, capable, lovable person and the** cultural∂ **figure of the disabled person** whom they take to be precisely my opposite:∂ worthless, incapable, and unlovable. **People with disabilities routinely**∂ **announce that they do not consider themselves as disabled.** Although∂ they are often repudiating the literal meaning of the word disabled, **their**∂ **words** nevertheless **serve to disassociate them from the identity group of**∂ **the disabled**. **Our culture offers** profound **disincentives** and few rewards∂ **to identifying as disabled**. The trouble with **such statements** is that they∂ **leave intact**, without challenge, **the oppressive stereotypes** **that permit**,∂ among other things, the **unexamined use of disability terms** such as crippled,∂ lame, dumb, idiot, moron as verbal gestures of derision. **The refusal**∂ **to claim disability identity is** in part **due to a lack of ways to understand**∂ **or talk about disability that are not oppressive**. People with disabilities∂ and those who care about them flee from the language of crippled or∂ deformed and have no other alternatives. Yet, the Civil Rights Movement∂ and the accompanying black-is-beautiful identity politics have∂ generally shown white culture what is problematic with saying to black∂ friends, "I don't think of you as black." Nonetheless, by disavowing disability∂ identity, many of us learned to save ourselves from devaluation∂ by a complicity that perpetuates oppressive notions about ostensibly real∂ disabled people. Thus, together we help make the alternately menacing∂ and pathetic cultural figures who rattle tin cups or rave on street corners,∂ ones we with impairments often flee from more surely than those who∂ imagine themselves as nondisabled.

Thus, the aff is the best method of allowing adolescents to examine and understand their identity in relation to disability- we must be able to allow agents to construe their own relation disability and mental illness. McRuer:

McRuer, Robert. "Compulsory Able-Bodiedness and Queer/Disabled Existence." *The Disability Studies Reader* (2006): 301-09. Taylor and Francis Group, LLC. Web. <Compulsory Able-Bodiedness and Queer/Disabled Existence>.

Like compulsory heterosexuality, then, **compulsory able-bodiedness functions by covering over**, with the appearance of choice, **a system in which there actually is no choice.** I would not locate this compulsion, moreover, solely in the past, with the rise of industrial capitalism. Just as the origins of heterosexual/homosexual identity are now obscured for most people so that compulsory heterosexuality functions as a disciplinary formation seemingly emanating from everywhere and nowhere, so too are **the origins of able-bodied/disabled identity obscured**, allowing what Susan Wendell calls “**the disciplines of normality**” (87) **to cohere in a system of compulsory able-bodiedness that similarly emanates from everywhere and nowhere. Able-bodied dilutions and misunderstandings of the minority thesis put forward in the disability rights movement and disability studies have** even, in some ways, **strengthened the system**: **the dutiful** (or docile) **able-bodied subject** now **recognizes that some groups of people have chosen to adjust to or even take pride in their “condition,” but that recognition**, and the tolerance that undergirds it**, covers over the compulsory nature of the able-bodied subject’s own identity.**7

The medical system forces people with disabilities to conform and become able-bodied identifying- it was a system that tried to exclude my disabilities and paint them as problems. Because the 1AC allows those with disabilities to resolve stigma and create positive identities, I affirm.

# Frontlines

## A2 Topicality/Theory

#### Reasonability Good

1. Competing interps creates a race to the bottom- means that debaters are more likely to read frivolous theory in an attempt to create a marginally better interpretation for debate- this is bad because it decreases substantive discussion and education- extend the Giroux card- we have to critically deconstruct power relations to learn how to approach oppression- controls the internal link to any education voter/outweighs fairness because there are always marginally unfair things going on in a round, but the whole point of the education space is critical discussion
2. The reasons that reasonability is arbitrary all devolve to why there’s no brightline- identifying and justifying a brightline not only solves but makes T/theory easier to evaluate because it gives you a clear way to comprehend what is real abuse- the argument that it involves to CI doesn’t make sense because it doesn’t, it just leads to us being forced to provide a proper weighing metric for abuse-that’s different

Thus- default reasonability with a brightline of structural abuse- this means they have the burden of proof to demonstrate that the structure of the aff makes it logically impossible to negate without reading theory- if they have any offense on case you can drop the shell because they have proven the only abuse is substantive- substantive abuse isn’t a reason to justify punishment because it just means there was a hard argument to answer- that’s just good debating

And- aff isn’t structurally abusive- there’s a 1:1 burden structure and you can make turns, links to Ks, have a methodology debate, read solvency deficits, etc- these all offer you the same strategic advantages you could have if I read a generic AC

#### K>T

**Their use of theory is part and parcel of the problem that the 1AC points out.** Their ruse of [education/fairness] is being used to shift discourse away from my advocacy, in the same way that the state uses appeals to the ethical to shift discourse away from their oppressive policies. **Claims of fairness and objectivity are ways to silence our voices. Delgado** Richard Delgado Law Professor at University of Colorado[[1]](#footnote-1)

**We have cleverly built power's view of the appropriate standard of conduct into the very term fair. Thus, the stronger party is able to have his/her way and see her/himself as principled at the same time**.Yet society and law accept only this latter message (or something like it), and not the former, more nuanced ones, to mean refusal. Why? **The "objective" approach is not inherently better or more fair. Rather, it is accepted because it embodies the sense of the stronger party, who centuries ago found himself in a position to dictate what permission meant. Allowing ourselves to be drawn into reflexive, predictable arguments about** administrability, **fairness,** stability, and ease of determination **points us away from what** **[\*821]  really counts: the way in which stronger parties have managed to inscribe their views and interests into "external" culture**, so that we are now enamored with that way of judging action. First, we read our values and preferences into the culture; then we pretend to consult that culture meekly and humbly in order to judge our own acts.

**Specifically, the law is created to curtail the options of the disabled body. Any praxis we take is delegitimized because it’s not rational or good enough. I am a disabled body. Telling me how I can engage in my personal praxis is demeaning and is the exact logic I am criticizing. That means your performance links into the role of the ballot- you act like the state, regulating what actions are right and wrong and attempting to normalize all behavior. You are the power structures I am criticizing at work- which means if I win my criticism your actions are oppressive and should be rejected.**

**If my practice makes things tough for you that’s good- intentionally giving control to those considered underdeveloped and incompetent helps to subvert society’s notions that only the traditional “competent adult” can make QUOTE proper decisions. I’m cripping your notion of fairness and taking it back for myself. Peace and Roy** Peace, William J. and Claire Roy < Visiting Professor, Renee Crown Honors Program, Syracuse University & Parent and Blogger, Life with a Severely Disabled Child>. “Scrutinizing Ashley X: Presumed Medical ‘Solutions’ vs. Real Social Adaptation.” The Journal of Philosophy, Science & Law: Disability Special Issue Volume 14, July 2, 2014, pages 33-52

**When one combines physical and cognitive deficits that limit one’s ability to be autonomous with the penchant for non-disabled others to assert their power, it is no wonder people with a disability are** socially isolated and **stigmatized**. Ells maintains, **the challenge for those with a disability is to retain**, regain, or re-configure **substantial autonomy despite autonomy loss brought on by the conditions of impairment** or the condition of one’s social situation… This struggle often involves grappling with barriers in housing, transportation, employment, rehabilitation, technology, education and the physical environment that interfere with acting independently” (Ells 2001, 606). **The efforts of people with a disability to be autonomous will always fail if they are expected** to aspire **to be typical,** specifically by using bipedal locomotion and without cognitive deficits. **It is** thus **more empowering to reject accepted beliefs associated with autonomy** (the struggle for independence) **and** insteadembrace situated autonomy. The fact is **[that] all people with a disability can be independent to a degree** within the confines of one’s socially constructed space. When one situates autonomy in a socio-cultural context, many possibilities are created that are not usually associated with autonomy. Ells has observed that “Access to social spaces and services and empowering relationships makes autonomy possible. In other words, situated independence is necessary to achieve the control necessary for governance” (Ells 2001, 606). The concept of situated autonomy is at odds with the larger social perception of autonomy as defined by Tom Beauchamp and James Childress (1994) in health care. As we understand Beauchamp and Childress, an autonomous person is one who freely acts in accordance with a self-chosen plan. Thus **autonomy is the personal rule of the self that is free from controlling interferences by others and from personal limitations that prevent meaningful choice.**

## A2 Biopower Alts

-double bind perm

-alt fails

-no link- aff is a prior rejection of biopower- rejects the state’s ability to medicalize the individual- that’s McRuer

## A2 Shared Consent

Turn: conflicts HIPPA

Turn: CA McRuer- means the medical system can’t be a proper mediator because they

## A2 Vague Alts

Turn- the 1AC resists repression- crip the notion of health care and the way that the individual is identified- this also means that state policies will never solve as well as simply granting rights, because it’s historically proven that this doesn’t work- the Garland Thompson evidence even talks about current disability legislature’s failure- it’s because the social and mentality change is a prerequisite to policies so that we don’t fall back into the same problems the current legislation faces

SOL- I have a higher risk of directly solving the root cause of the problem because I crip the notion of autonomy in the first place- creates an open avenue for disability discussion. Also your link is so small that the likelihood of the impact is only relative to the exact impact of the aff- also your alt fails to be a guide to action so there’s a higher probability of failure so I have a higher chance of achieving success.

## A2 Autonomy Criticism

**Intentionally giving control to those considered underdeveloped and incompetent helps to subvert society’s notions that only the traditional “competent adult” can make QUOTE proper decisions. I’m cripping your notion of fairness and taking it back for myself. Peace and Roy** Peace, William J. and Claire Roy < Visiting Professor, Renee Crown Honors Program, Syracuse University & Parent and Blogger, Life with a Severely Disabled Child>. “Scrutinizing Ashley X: Presumed Medical ‘Solutions’ vs. Real Social Adaptation.” The Journal of Philosophy, Science & Law: Disability Special Issue Volume 14, July 2, 2014, pages 33-52

**When one combines physical and cognitive deficits that limit one’s ability to be autonomous with the penchant for non-disabled others to assert their power, it is no wonder people with a disability are** socially isolated and **stigmatized**. Ells maintains, **the challenge for those with a disability is to retain**, regain, or re-configure **substantial autonomy despite autonomy loss brought on by the conditions of impairment** or the condition of one’s social situation… This struggle often involves grappling with barriers in housing, transportation, employment, rehabilitation, technology, education and the physical environment that interfere with acting independently” (Ells 2001, 606). **The efforts of people with a disability to be autonomous will always fail if they are expected** to aspire **to be typical,** specifically by using bipedal locomotion and without cognitive deficits. **It is** thus **more empowering to reject accepted beliefs associated with autonomy** (the struggle for independence) **and** insteadembrace situated autonomy. The fact is **[that] all people with a disability can be independent to a degree** within the confines of one’s socially constructed space. When one situates autonomy in a socio-cultural context, many possibilities are created that are not usually associated with autonomy. Ells has observed that “Access to social spaces and services and empowering relationships makes autonomy possible. In other words, situated independence is necessary to achieve the control necessary for governance” (Ells 2001, 606). The concept of situated autonomy is at odds with the larger social perception of autonomy as defined by Tom Beauchamp and James Childress (1994) in health care. As we understand Beauchamp and Childress, an autonomous person is one who freely acts in accordance with a self-chosen plan. Thus **autonomy is the personal rule of the self that is free from controlling interferences by others and from personal limitations that prevent meaningful choice.**

## A2 Anthro

Turn- normality is the justification for oppression- means the aff already deconstructs the systems of power that encourage the conception of autonomy you talk about by driving the focus and power away from the normal

Baynton 2013 (Douglas C, “Disability and the Justification of Inequality in American History”, The Disability Studies Reader 17 (2013): 33-57.)

The metaphor of the natural versus the monstrous was a fundamental way of constructing social reality in Burke’s time. By the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, however, the concept of the natural was to a great extent displaced or subsumed by the concept of normality.3 Since then, normality has been deployed in all aspects of modern life as a means of measuring, categorizing, and managing populations (and resisting such management). Normality is a complex concept, with an etiology that includes the rise of the social sciences, the science of statistics, and industrialization with its need for interchangeable parts and interchangeable workers. It has been used in a remarkable range of contexts and with a bewildering variety of connotations. The natural and the normal both are ways of establishing the universal, unquestionable good and right. Both are also ways of establishing social hierarchies that justify the denial of legitimacy and certain rights to individuals or groups. Both are constituted in large part by being set in opposition to culturally variable notions of disability—just as the natural was meaningful in relation to the monstrous and the deformed, so are the cultural meanings of the normal produced in tandem with disability.4

Also, turn- your attempt to abstract the debate through links of omission and ontology shift the focus from my advocacy- this is an example of how people generally prioritize the more powerful voices

**Delgado** Richard Delgado Law Professor at University of Colorado[[2]](#footnote-2)

**We have cleverly built power's view of the appropriate standard of conduct into the very term fair. Thus, the stronger party is able to have his/her way and see her/himself as principled at the same time**.Yet society and law accept only this latter message (or something like it), and not the former, more nuanced ones, to mean refusal. Why? **The "objective" approach is not inherently better or more fair. Rather, it is accepted because it embodies the sense of the stronger party, who centuries ago found himself in a position to dictate what permission meant. Allowing ourselves to be drawn into reflexive, predictable arguments about** administrability, **fairness,** stability, **and** ease of **determination** **points us away from what  [\*821]  really counts: the way in which stronger parties have managed to inscribe their views and interests into "external" culture**, so that we are now enamored with that way of judging action. First, we read our values and preferences into the culture; then we pretend to consult that culture meekly and humbly in order to judge our own acts.

1. , 1992 [Richard, “Shadowboxing: An Essay On Power,” In Cornell Law Review, May] [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. , 1992 [Richard, “Shadowboxing: An Essay On Power,” In Cornell Law Review, May] [↑](#footnote-ref-2)